UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,352	05/21/2007	Hans Van Der Laan	081468-0356680	8164
	7590 05/13/200 VINTHROP SHAW PI	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 10500			TON, TRI T	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2877	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/590,352	VAN DER LAAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
TRI T. TON	2877		

	TRI T. TON	2877					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request				
periods: a) The period for reply expires <u>3 months from the mailing date</u>	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	liaman with 27 OFD 44 27 mount by						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further col	nsideration and/or search (see NOT						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication among (1 1 02 02 1).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>13-15 and 34-36</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12,16,18-20,22-33,37 and 39-41</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Gregory J. Toatley, Jr./							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2877							

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Response to Arguments

.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments see pages 9-12, filed on 04/22/09, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 11 and 22 under 102(e) have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

First, with respect to Applicants' remarks on page 10, Mieher et al. (Publication No. US 2003/0048458) discloses comparing the obtained spectral measurement data with the calibration spectral measurement data ([0047], [0080], lines 7-13), (measured spectrum is not different from spectral measurement data, and simulated spectrum is not different from calibration spectral measurement data), to determine the unknown value ([0080], lines 12-13), (the error value is reduced to the specified value. The error value is not different from unknown value) of said at least one process parameter for said substrate from said obtained spectral measurement data (paragraph [0008]) by employing said regression coefficients of said mathematical model (paragraph [0060], [0080], claims 16, 17):

Second, with respect to Applicants' remarks on pages 10-11, Mieher discloses measure spectra being interpreted into shape parameter information ([0080], lines 1-3). This does not mean that shape parameter information is the same or not the same as spectral measurement data. Shape parameter information of measurement spectra is an only type of spectral measurement data. In other words, spectral measurement data could be shape parameter information or could be numeric parameter information.

Furthermore, Applicants did not disclose that spectral measurement data, which must be numeric data or could not be shape parameter information data. More importantly, even if the Applicants disclosed that spectral measurement data could not be shape parameter information data, the conflicts are shown on figure 4 of current application; whereas, according to this figure, calibration spectrum values are converted into shape information for comparing.

May, 06 20, 2009 Examiner /TTT/.